Previous references.

1901.

~~191~~

(Sep. Revenue)

File No. 14 of 94-95

Serial Nos. 1–16.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1–16.

Major ~~Part B.~~ for April 1901.

SUBJECT

Claim of Nilgiri Puttanna for the Refund of Rs500/- held in deposit in connection with his Late Toddy Contract

---

SC1. From Nilgiri Puttanna, Sowcar, Devaraj inhabitant Mysore.

Petition Registered No 83/870 dt. 18/Sep 94.

Submits appeal petition praying for the Refund of Rs500/- said to have been held in deposit by the Dy Commr, Mysore Distt, for the Settlement of certain Inamdar's Claim to Toddy Revenue for that period.

GPB—4,000—4-7-11

SC2

SL 2 To the Dy Comm^r Mysore Distt No Pet-490 dt- 1-10-94.

Forwards the above Petition to the Dy Comm^r Mysore Distt for Report.

SL 3. From Nilgiri Puttanna, Devaraj Mohalla Mysore.

Petition Registered No 3336 dt- 10-6-95.

Submits petition praying that his Case may be disposed of soon, and that the Dy Comm^r Mysore Distt, may be directed to return him the said Sum of Rs 500/-

SL 4. From Nilgiri Puttanna, Devaraj Mohalla, Mysore,

Petition Registered No 987 dt- 30/8/95

Submits a reminder Petition praying that the matter may be disposed of soon, and that the amount deposited may be refunded.

SL 5. From the Dy Comm^r Mysore Distt No 3738 dt- 12/9/95.

Reports on the Petition of Nilgiri Puttanna praying for the refund of Rs 500/- held in deposit in connection with his late Abkari Contract.

SL 6. To the Dy Comm^r Mysore Distt

No Pet-736 dt- 24-9/3-10 } 95

Calls for a further Report after full investigation into the matter, as many points are not yet clear for Settlement.

SL 7

: CM of 94-95

Note

Was there any shop at Kreinkere either during the two years in question or at any other time? Are there any Toddy Groves in the Village & if so are the trees thereon tapped for the benefit of any Arrack Shop? Does the Tannadar entitle the Inamdar of this Village to any Toddy Revenue? What is that to show that the payment of Rs 300/- which Distt Contractor used to make, was an ape of both this Village and Gyanagund? No enquiry seems to have been held or finding recorded The Dy Comrs order seems based entirely on surmise. An investigation should now,

Note on page 20 Serial 5 of this file.

now we need a decision arrived at.

Draft accordingly for submission to Hon'ble Councillor

22-9-95

received 22.9.

The Dy Comm'r's further report shows that the Iramdar's claim to the Eddy revenue of Arsikere in Mysore taluk should be disallowed while his claim to Sanyasana in Nanjangud taluk must be admitted. The petr Puttanna's contract includes the village of Arsikere and not Sanyasana. The deposit of Rs 500, the Dy Comm'r says, may be returned

= It is to be feared the investigation has not been quite

"formal" as directed by
the Proc of 1893

The asst Comm^r says in
his finding that the Inamdar
"genuinely" has nothing
to say to the above facts
It would have been most
satisfactory if the Inamdar's
statement had been taken
& the Inamdar admits
that he has no claim to
the toddy revenue of
Arsunkere; then the deposit
of Rs 500 may be returned
to the petr. Otherwise
there would be a separate
appeal from the Inamdar

The proc no 6621 of 19/1/98
Ex 238

Quoted by the asst Comr in his
printed in the Proc book but
abstracts given in Part II

Any order to be issued in this
case will have to be sent-
through the Ex Comr

17/5/98

Transferred to Executive 17/5/98

Transd
18/5/98

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore

Read —

The following petitions from —
Chelua Iyengar alias Sampathu Iyengar
Inamdar of Dudgere Village, Mysore
District, in the matter of his claim to
the Toddy Revenue of that Village: —

Registered No. 4140 dated 26th June 1896
— Do — 2987 — do — 3rd April 1897
— Do — 390 — do — 3rd August 1897

(2) Also letter No. 462/50 dated 17th July 1896
from the Excise Commissioner in Mysore
forwarding with his opinion the record
of the enquiry relating to the above claim.

Order thereon No. 6621/Ex 238
Dated Bangalore 19th January 1898.

Of the documents relied on
by the petitioner, the Sannad of 1827
does not expressly authorize the levy
of Abkari Revenue, and the term
alienated does not include toddy
arrack or drug. The Inam-Title-Deed
acknowledges the Inamdar's right to
"the" revenue accruing from date
trees"; but this is a very different
thing

from "Excise Revenue" or "Right of Arrack", which, the same title-deed expressly reserves to Government. Under the circumstances, the petitioner is entitled under the new system of toddy administration, to no more than the tree-rent from the Dale grove in his Inam Village minus the cost of collection. The tree-tax as well as the revenue derived from the shop should be credited to Government.

(Signed) L. Anantasami Rao
For Secretary.

Note

Letter no 184 dated 29th April 1898 from the Dy Commr Mysore District recommending the refund to Nilgiri puttanna of Rs 500/- said to be held in deposit in connection with his late toddy Contract

In his petition dated 18th September 1894, Sowcar Nilgiri puttanna, late toddy Contractor of ~~the~~ prayed for the refund of Rs 500/- said to have been withheld ~~in deposit~~ by the Deputy Commr Mysore Distt in connection with the claim to toddy revenue of certain the Inamdar of Arsikere village. The petition was referred to the Dy Commr & he reported as follows:—

"The petitioner Nilgiri puttanna held the toddy Contract of the Mysore & Seringapatam talukas from 1st April 90 to 31st March 92 and A. C. Moodappa,

of the Nanjangud & four other
taluks for the same period.

Arainkere in the Mysore
taluk and Ganagnur in the
Nanjangud taluk were included
in their leases. They are both
inam villages belonging to Mr Gopal rajurs
and have been under Government
management.

The persons that held
the Contract of the whole District
prior to 1890 were paying the inamdars
a lump sum of Rs 300/- per year
on account of toddy Revenue for both
the villages referred to above.

The toddy revenue of these
villages at the same rate of Rs 300/-
became due for 1890-91 & 1891-92
from the petitioner & R. C. Moodappa
and they were accordingly directed
to pay up the amount.

R. C. Moodappa agreed
to pay half the sum on account of
Ganagnur village but the
~~Govt~~ petitioner ~~refused~~ argued that the sum
of Rs 300/- a year should be
divided ~~between them~~ in the
proportion to the amounts
actually realized for the
villages at the sales held
by Govt since the introduction
of the new toddy system in 1892-93

According to the sales held by Govt the following sums were realized —

	1892-93	1893-94
For Ganaganur village.	72/-	108/-
" Arsinkere "	"	"

The result showed that nothing was due from the petitioner for Arsinkere village.

On this, the former Dy. Commr directed that R. B. Moddappa should pay Rs 200/- for Ganagnur and that Narasimmappa, the balance viz Rs 100/- for Arsinkere & for carrying out this order the sum of Rs 500/- one of the deposits made by the petitioner has been withheld."

On the above report of the Dy. Commr did not furnish complete information, Govt in their proc. no. pol-736 dt 24/9/95 made the following enquiries viz

(1) whether there was any shop at Arsinkere village either during the two years in question or at any other time

(2) whether there were any

toddy trees in the village, if so whether the trees therein were tapped for the benefit of any & what shop.

(3) whether the Kannad entitled the inamdar of the village to any toddy revenue.

(4) whether there was any thing to show that the payment of Rs 300/- which the Distt. Contractor agreed to make was on account of both this village and Kanagurve.

The Dy. Commr was further requested to submit his decision in the matter after holding an investigation into the matter.

The Dy Commr in his letter under disposal replies—

that according to the enquiry recently held, there existed no shop in Arsinkere either during the two years in question or for a long time anterior thereto.

That there are no toddy trees in the village from which toddy is drawn for the benefit of any shop.

That with regard to the payment made to the inamdars

9

In ~~fasli~~ previous years, it is found that the exact ammnt is Rs 304-13-4 per year and not Rs 300/- and that that payment was for both the villages, and that, as per enquiry held into the Inamdar's claim of ~~Inamdar~~ to toddy revenue, it is found that the claim is admissible in the case of Ganapur ~~of [illegible]~~ ~~to~~ but that in the case of Arsinkere village, the claim has been disallowed in the light of the Government order ~~in a similar cases~~ no 6621/Sr 238 dt 19th January 198 and other facts cited above. (vide copy of the finding enclosed).

put up.

The Deputy Commr states that ~~recommends~~ under the above circumstances, N. puttanna is not liable to pay anything to the Inamdar and accordingly recommends that the ~~deposit sum~~ of Rs 500/- held in deposit may be returned to the petitioner

The report was called for direct

from the Dy Commr and

it has therefore not been re-

ceived through the Excise Commr

~~to whom a reference will be~~

~~made if apprised before final~~

~~orders can be passed in the~~

~~matter~~.

Subd to the Secy

KJ 4/6

4/6/98.

Send the record to the

Excise Inspr from whom

I shall like to receive

answer to the requisition

for a report was

sent direct to the

Dy Comrs office

7/6/98

Drafted

KJ 7/6/98.

As directed above the Excise

Commrs opinion was called

for in this office no 11430 & 9.6.98

and the Excise Commr accord-

3)

(Office Note continued)

"

As directed above, the Excise Commissioner was requested to report on the marginally noted points and in reply he states in his letter under reference as follows:—

That on careful examination and enumeration of the date trees existing at Atsinkere, it has been ascertained that there are altogether 657 date trees in it, all of them being fit for tapping and that 4 of them which are very old, even bear incisions indicating that toddy was used to be drawn during

*Query No1. There was no toddy shop at Atsinkere either during the two years in question or for a long time previously, nor are there any date trees in it. How then was the Contractor liable to pay any money to the Inamdar?

—"—No2. Was the Contractor in any way to blame for not setting up a shop at Atsinkere?

during the District Farming Contract System, and that as the District Contractors under the old system used to keep some shops open and close others according to their convenience, they were liable to pay the Inamdar the amount due to him on account of toddy Revenue of the village.

That the old District Contractors who were thus liable to pay the amount on account of toddy Revenue of the village, were to blame for not setting up a shop at Arsikere where one appears to have existed before 1875.

Replies

Nos 3. Has any shop been opened since 1892-93?

No 4. Has Govt. paid the Inamdar on account of Arsikere since 1892-93?

See No 13 (a) Col. page.

Replies to queries Nos 3 & 4 were found in the following terms in the copy of the Deputy Commr's order, and consequently they were not communicated to the Excise Comm.

"Since the new toddy administration came into force in 1892-93, there is neither shop in the village, nor has the bab been sold."

As already reported, the Inamdar has been in the receipt of toddy Revenue on account of both these two villages up to 1889-90, at the rate of ~~Rs~~ 304-13-4 per year. The question is whether the Inamdar of Arsikere and Gangaur villages

villages, is entitled to the payment of toddy Revenue of the villages from the old District Contractors for 1890-91 and 1891-92, ~~as~~ as in pre vious years, and if so what amount should be withheld out of the sum of Rs 500/- deposited by Vilgiri Puttanna on account of Arsikere which was included in his Circle during the two years in question.

During these years, (i.e., 1890-91 and 1891-92) the two villages, one realising some revenue and the other none, were each ~~were each~~ included in areas farmed out for two different Contractors, and hence the

dispute

4)

dispute arose as to how the payment should be regulated for each village separately.

After some enquiry made, the Deputy Commr settled once in 1895 that the payment ~~should~~ should be made by R. C. Muddappa and K. Puttamma in the proportion of 200 to 100 for the villages of Gangavur and Arsikere respectively. Whether this settlement was agreed to or not by both the Contractors, is not known.

In the subsequent enquiry

in 1898

enquiry held into the
Inamdar's right to
toddy Revenue of the
two villages ~~in 1898~~,
the claim to toddy Re-
venue of the Arsikere
village was disallowed
in the light of the Go-
vernment Proceedings
No. $\frac{6621}{238}$ dt 19-1-98 (passed
in the case of Dudgere
Inamdar's right to
toddy Revenue) in which it
was laid down that
"the Revenue accruing
from date trees" is quite
different from "the Ex-
cise Revenue" or "right
of Abkari". The Excise
Commr, however, differ-
ed from the Deputy Commr,
and

and reported in his previous letter No 1115/57 dated 8th August 1898, that the order passed in the Government Proceedings quoted, was not applicable in the case of Arsikere as the circumstances existing in each case were quite different.

If under the circumstances set forth above, the Inamdar is entitled to toddy Revenue of the Arsikere village for 1890-91 and 1891-92, the question reduces itself to — what deduction should be made on account of the toddy Revenue of the village in question out of the Sum of Rs500

deposited

R. No (15)

deposited by Nilgiri

Puttanna.

Submitted, Secretary

kg 7/6/99. The Exam^r is of the opinion that the Inamdar is entitled to the toddy revenue of Arsikere also and that the old District Contractor were liable to pay money to the Inamdar -

V 7/6/99

15^0 35

This is also an old file. Delayed on the Secretariat. Send to the Assistant Commissioner for favour of early disposal

[signature]

V 31/10/1900

Submitted to 2^d Councillor

V 1/11/00

2/11/00

535

Please place before the Hon'ble Dewan for his

5

of orders. His Highness
regarding how Abkari
questions should be
dealt with seem to
differ from mine &
I do not wish to
go against his wishes
you may carry out
whatever orders he is
pleased to pass.

H. Jean Chevalier
Esq
Mysore

9/1/1900
01.

Sent to Offg Dewan
6
10/1/07

16178

10/1/07.

× This is the second
a statement of I have
differed from the Dewan
in any particular case
a sense of duty impelled
me to do so. In this
case the Head of the
must record his
own opinion and give
directions & Secretariat
to dispose of the case
accordingly unless it deems
it necessary to keep the

can't come under
the Rules as far

12. 1. 1901

P.S. I am sorry that
I've should pass remarks
of this kind about officers
to which on any human
opinion can not possibly

12/1/1901

Rec'd 16/1/01
945

16-1-07

Seen 16/1/01

will the ~~Office~~ he
should enough to give
his opinion?

17/1/1901

I had allowed time to lie
over pending the decision
of the Legal Question of
Guardians rights to
lodge petitions. That
Question has not as
yet been decided. After
a personal discussion

b)

with the Revenue Dir
K-Shesharadri Iyer), the
after receiving explan
general instructions
from him, the Excise
Commissioner passed a Order
of Draft Rules which
were published
allowed the Petitioner
Day (17th June) by
Notification, the
Petitioner was granted
to the Draft Rules
Petitioner filed the
Rules finally issued by
the Government in the
the present case
named became
entitled to the benefit
Revenue of the Village
of Anekal, in a
Point on which
depends the deter
-mination of the
question whether
Petitioner is liable
to pay Rs. 100 or
any other sum for
each of the two
Years under above

– Cases arising 1890–91 & 1891–92.

If no such right
found to exist in the
Sultan he cannot
of course, and
Pultamma cannot
therefore be required to
make any payment.
But if it is found
that such a right
does exist, Pultamma
must pay such
amount as Govt
might deem reasonable.
In the absence of
definite and finally
agreed rules regulating
the division of duandum,
claims, the Govt
on the construction
of an order of
Govt dated 1st August 1894
held that the
Zemindar of Anantkere
is not entitled to
the lastage receipts
that Village, which
that Court later
differed and
held that he is entitled.

withheld pending the
determination of the
question whether the
Inamdar is entitled
to the Rs 304 per annum
of the Village of Arsambe
or not - The record shows
that the Inamdar used
to get from the [illegible]
District Collector
until the end of the
year a sum of Rs
304 — 13 — 0 but this pay
-ment is said to
have been in lieu of the
-tion of the claim
for the Rs 304 per annum
of both Mahalkari &
Gangaram Mahpa-
-(only the payment of
that sum to be no
bar to the petitioner
in case he establishes
that payment was
being made on account
of both the Villages - or only
one that of Gangaram
Rs 304 per annum he is clear
that there is no question
-tion for any longer
withholding the whole
of the allowance of Rs
of 500 Rs - Accordingly

Undisputed sum
-tion, Rs 1,52,304-13-2
= 1-52-6-6 on account
of Assistant Will
according to the
sworn report his
liability does not
exceed Rs 100. In any event
such liability cannot
exceed the former
sum - This will be
deducted from the balance
of the deposit of Rs
5000 refunded to
the Union account
without prejudice to
his claiming Rs the whole
or any portion of
the sum thus deducted
should it be necessary
held that the Lodge
remains on account
of Assistant is Rs
Rs - In order to that
the amount withheld
is sufficient -

Please give me
order in the above terms
Clause - Expenses Rs 1,52,304-13-2
of the sum by an Endorsement

2/4/07.

(General Serial No. 32.) (1) 81

1894 870

No. Camp Regd No 63

Name of Petitioner. Niligiri Puttanna Sowcar

Village. Devaraj mohalla

Taluk. Mysore

District. Mysore.

Date of Arzi. 18-9-94

Date of Receipt. 18th September 94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. — one —

ABSTRACT.

Appeal petition

Petitioner states that he was the Abkari contractor of the Mysore Sub Division from April 1890 to March 1892 and prays for the refund of Rs 5000/— said to have been held in deposit by the Deputy Commr Mysore District for the settlement of certain Daidars claims to Todd

147
521

To Dy Commr
Report on the
Case — The
Petitioner are
at present
from the Civil
Station Mysore
to the Hill
Station
Ootacamund
18/9/94

Draft sent
MK
18/9

Received 27 Sept
Secretary Mysore
Advocate for the Petitioner

COURT FEE
18 9 94
TWO RUPEES

DIWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
CAMP Mysore
REG'D. No 63
DATE 18/9/94

Attested by Advocate

Ex. 14 of 94-95

DIWAN'S OFFICE.
REG'D. No 870
DATE 20-9-94

2 Rs Stamp affixed

4

5

9

7

8

18-9-94

7—8—92 7—8—94

Vide copy Regd
No. 36

In the Court of the Dy Commissioner

Mysore District

Dated Mysore 22nd July 1894

Before A. Rangasami Iyengar Esqr: B.A.B.L

Dy Commissioner
" Mysore district

Read petition dated 10th April 1894

presented by Mr. Venkataramaiah
1st grade pleader on behalf of Kulajira
Puttanna late Abkari contractor
Mysore Sub Division praying that
the Government of India remit Rs.
Rupees 500 kept by him as deposit
as security for the settlement of
the Coddy Revenue of Arasinkere
Inam village in pursuance of his
mutchalika dated 15th October 1892

May

May

2nd page

may be returned to him

Order

From the recent sales it is clear that Arasuvare is much poorer than Ganagavaram. If we take the proportion of recent sales Arasuvare would not be liable at all. But this is no criterion as the contractor must have been indirectly benefited and probably Arasukere's share now goes to swell the Revenue of some other place.

A rough division is therefore necessary and I think the 300 rupees a year may be apportioned at 2/3rds or 200 rupees for Ganagavaram and 100 for Arasuvare. If Puttanna agrees his claim may be settled at once subject to future order of Government. Collect balance from Muttappa. I assume that it is

M Elly

3rd page

is Deputy Commissioner's duty to make a settlement between the 2 contractors and make each liable for his share. If he are not liable to do so, he can collect the whole from Puttanna as he have got his cash and leave him to recover from Muddanna his share by a Civil suit

Sd/- A. Narayanam Iyengar

Deputy Commissioner

Comp.d

Mr Puttanna
Pur of Srirangapatna

"Copy"

Sd/- Krishnaiyar

Revenue Sheristedar

Mysore District

Copy applied for by Kadajari Puttanna on 7-8-94

Copy ready for delivery on do

Copy delivered on 17. 8. 94 may

Number of words 244

Copying fee 0-4-6
Comparing 0-1-0
Paper cost
Total

G.S. Ramanna
Scribe to Commissioner
Mysore District

No. Pet 490 / 208/2882 1-10-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

(2)

Camp Rep

The accompanying Petition No. 63 870

dated 18th Septr 94 received at the

Dewan's Office from Sowcar Nilicjiri Puttanna late Abkari Contractor, residing in Devaraj mohalla, Mysore, praying for the refund of Rs 500/- held in deposit by the Deputy ~~is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the~~ Commr, Mysore Distrct, for the settlement of certain Inamdars' claims to Doddy Revenue, is forwarded to pet with its one enclosure to the Deputy Commr, Mysore Distt, for a report on the case. The details are not evident from the copy of the Deputy Commr's order appended to the petition

SL 2

By Order,

Draft

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
19 Sept 1894
1/10/94

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—17-11-92—3,000.

Rep 15/6 Memo dt 490 of 19.9.94

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1895 (3)

15/6

Refers par f. S. R 140 of 94-95

SC 3

17/6

Subd to the Rev. Secretary.
The report called for in O.M. No Rev 490.
dtd 19. 9. 94 has not been recd. A
21/6 reminder is subd.
attended to
SWR 22/6

No. 3336

Name of Petitioner. Valiathan Vellori Puttanna

Village. residing at Devara Kudal

Taluk. Mysore

District.

Date of Arzi. 8-6-95

Date of Receipt. 10-6-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

States that he had obtained the abkari
contract of the Mysore Sub Division from
April 1890 to End of March 1892 - that on
of the Govt. Pro. notes produced by him fo
deposit all of them were returned to him
Except that of Rs. 500/= that though he
has been requesting for the return of the
amount for the last 2½ years yet he
has been pleased to comply with his re
-quest - that Arasina Kere had be
-longed to his Sub Division and par
-tner to that of Nanjanagud the con
-tract of which had been granted
Chikka Huddahka - that the Dy
Comm. has decided that the above t
villages belong to Varavanamy an
that Rs. 500/= should be paid to him

dollars annually and that out of which two-third
of the amount should be paid to Ramanna and
one-third to Krishnakere - that this decision
is unjust - that his deposit amount has no connection
with the amount due to Sarvamangalamma - that
they have not sued him for the amount - that the
Sarvamangalamma are not entitled to any such amount
for Krishnakere - that they have not established their right
thus by the production of Kaulnamas &c. - that neither the
former nor present Contractors have ever paid this
amount to the Sarvamangalamma - that though he
requested that the matter might on Examination of Accounts &c
be settled yet he without enquiry decided the matter without
any Enquiry against him - that the Dy. Comr. instead of Enquiring
and directing that he should pay the same amount which the
former and the present Contractors used to pay to Sarvamangalamma
has simply ordered him to pay one-third portion - that Chikka-
-huddappa and he are not joint Contractors - that he is not responsible
for the amount due by the former - that when he requested the Dy. Comr.
to pay him the amount under dispute he told him that he has withheld
the said on account of money due to Govt. by others and that he might see
Comr Chikkahuddappa for the amount - that on 18-9-96 he
preferred an appeal to this office - that he was informed in Endorsement
No. $\frac{63}{870}$ of $\frac{19-9-96}{1}$ that his petition had been sent to the Dy. Comr. for
report - and that he is at a loss to know how his appeal has been
disposed of - Prays that the matter may be disposed of soon and the
Dy. Comr. may be directed to return him the said Sum of Rs. 500/=

14/6.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. No. 3336/95
DATE 10-6-95

Petn Hbly
10/6/95

3336

ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವಿಜ್ಞಾಪನೆ

ಶ್ರೀಮಂತ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಸಿಂಹಾಸನಾರೋಹಣ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವದ ಸಂಭ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಉಪಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ಬಡ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಖಜಾನೆಯಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಅದರ ಬಡ್ಡಿಯಿಂದ ಬರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷ ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅದರಂತೆ ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

1890ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ 1892ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಕರಾರಿನಂತೆ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗವಾದ ರೂ. 1/3 ಅಕ್ಷರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಂದ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿದರು. ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಪ್ರಾಮಿಸರಿ ನೋಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಷರಾ ಬರೆದುಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

8-6-95

2.1
311 (8 S. R 14 7947
SL 4
233 Land-L-G Not disposed

Reminder

(6)

15

en. Serial No. 32.]

1895

No. 981

Name of Petitioner. Neelagiri Puttamma

Village. Devarajamohalla

Taluk. Mysore

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 27-8-95

Date of Receipt. 30-8-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

wah 7/9

Pdr 497

Refers papers

10/9.

Draft another reminder

11/9

12-9-95

Reminder.

ABSTRACT.

States that ~~out~~ of the deposit which he had made for Abkari contract of the Mysore Sub Division for 90/91 & 91/92 Rs 5-00-0-0 is still due to him; that though he has been requesting the Depty Commr for the last two or three years the same has not been ~~given~~ paid to him; that the Dy Comr decided that he should pay 1/3 ~~to~~ and 2/3 shares respectively of the Toddy Revenue of the Sarvamanya villages of Arasunkere & Ganagur that such payment has not been made to the Inamdars either

either by previous or subsequent
contractors and consequently
by Court's decision is unjust;
that there is no connection between
his deposit money and
the amount to be paid to the Inamdars;
that upon his appeal the Deputy Court
passed the order without looking into either
the Sanad or the records connected therewith;
that it would have been just if he had
been made to pay the amount paid by either
the previous or subsequent contractors and
that he and Chicknuddappa were not
joint contractors and that consequently
he was not held responsible for the
amount due by Chicknuddappa and
that though he appealed long ago the
matter has not been decided.

He now requests that the
matter may be disposed of and the
deposit amount returned to him.

K.M. 31/8.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. N. 981 R
DATE 30-8-95

981

30.8.95

[illegible] $\frac{2}{3}$ [illegible] $\frac{1}{3}$ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] $\frac{1}{3}$ [illegible]

[illegible]

500 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೀರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು
18-9-94 ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಅಡಮಾನ
ಶೀಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ 95 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೇ 5 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಂದು
ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟವರು
ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಒಪ್ಪಂದದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟವರು
ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು
ಕೊಡಲು 3 ತಿಂಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೂ ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟವರು
ಅವಧಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ
ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡವರು ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು
ಅನುಭವಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ
ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟವರು ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡವರಿಗೆ
ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟವರಿಗೆ
ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು
ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ
ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟವರು ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡವರಿಗೆ
ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ 500 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು
ಕೊಡಲು ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟವರಿಗೆ ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡವರು
ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಅವಧಿಯು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕೊನೆಯಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ
ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟವರು ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡವರಿಗೆ
ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ 500 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು
ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು
ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡವರು ಅಡಮಾನಿಟ್ಟವರಿಗೆ
ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ

ದಿ- 27-8-1895

645

S.R. No. 794-95

SLS



From

The Deputy Commissioner,

of the Mysore District.

To Rev Govt

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 12
Despatched
Received
} September 1895

(8)

Enclosures No. Two

No. 373

Reports on petition of Nelgeri Puttamah praying for the refund of Rs 500 which have been held in deposit in connection with his late abkarri contract

Was there any track or road in Aroumbere entered during the 2 years in question or at any other time? Are there any Govt trees on the Village site? If so are the trees therein tabbed for the benefit of any & what shop? Does the Lambadi enter the Limits of this Village & any body witness what is here stated & there that the Monument of Rs 300 which the District Contractor used to may make, was on account of both this Village & Gamagamu? No enquiry seems to have been held or finding recorded. The Commissioner seems based entirely on surmise. His investigation shows

Pet
R. Hob
6/9/95

Reporting reference RR 5/9

Sub & the Rev Secy

RR 7/9

No. 373
Enclosures No. Two

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore September 13 1895.

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
of the Mysore District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Revd Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt of Mysore.

SIR. .

With reference to the Chief Secretary's Offcial memo No Pet 490 of the 19th September 1894 and remmders No 24428 Pet No: 1894 of the 24th June 1895 and No: 2494 Pet No: 497 of the 30th August 1895, calling for a report on the petition of Nilegiri Puttanna of Mysore, praying for the refund of Rupees 500 held in deposit in connection with his late abkarri Contract, I beg to state as follows: —

2. The petitioner Nilegiri Puttannah held the toddy Contract of the Mysore and the Serangapatam

Seringapatam Taluqs from 1st April 1890

to the 31st March 1892, and R. C. Moodappa

of the Nanjangud and four other taluks

for the same period.

3 Arsukere in the Mysore taluk and

Gangavoor in the Nanjangud taluk were

included in their leases. They are both

inam villages belonging to Mr. Gopalraj

Urs and have been under Government

management as per Government order No.

2068-9 of the 4th December 1887.

4. The persons that held the toddy

Contract of the whole district prior to

1890 were paying the Inamdar of the said

2 villages a lumpsum of Rs 300 per year for

both the villages on account of the toddy-

revenue thereof.

5. The toddy revenue of those villages

at

at the same rate of Rs 300 a year for the years 1890-91 and 1891-92 became due from the petitioner Nilgiri Puttamah and R. C. Muddappa.

6. Notices were issued to both of them to appear before the Deputy Commissioner on the 18th August 1893 with their accounts, if any, to shew what amount was payable on account of each of the two villages, with a note that if they failed to do so, proceedings would be taken to recover the dues according to rules.

7. R. C. Muddappa Contractor of the Ranjangud taluk filed a written statement dated the 6th September 1893, binding himself to pay on account of the Ganaganoor village in the Ranjangud taluk

taluk a half the said amount of 300 Rupees.

8. The petitioner Niligiri Puttamah the Contractor of the Mysore taluk in which the other village of Arsinkere is, sent his agent to say that it was hard to ask him to pay the other half the amount and proposed that the amount of 300 Rupees should be divided between him and the other Contractor in proportion to the amounts realized for the villages at the sales held by Government since the introduction of the present amani System.

9. During the sales held by Government the following Sums were realized viz-

For

	In 1892-93	In 1893-94
For Ganagamoor in the Ranjangud taluk.	72-"-"	108-"-"
For Arsukere in the Mysore taluk.		

This result shewed that there was nothing to be paid by the petitioner for the Arsukere village.

10. Upon this, however, the former Deputy Commissioner ordered on the 27th July 1894, that R. C. Muddappa the Contractor of the Ranjangud taluk should pay Rs 200 for Ganagamoor and the petitioner Rs 100 for Arsukere. For the purpose of carrying out that order 500 Rupees out of the deposit of the petitioner have been withheld and it is against this that he

he has now appealed to Government.

His contention is, that nothing is properly claimable from him for the village of Irsinkere for 1890-91 and 1891-92 inasmuch as it fetched nothing at the Subsequent Sales held by Government.

11. The enclosures of the reference under reply are resubmitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

K. Venkatanarayya
Deputy Commissioner
Nyapore District

Compd:
Ally.

S.R. 14 of 97

Presented in person
Pet: Branch
Please register & send
to Excise Branch
Intd: L.A.
15/12/97

Reference 28/12/97

Rec'd 31/12/97

To. Veri: Records for refees.

Rec'd
2/1/98.

[illegible] 15-9-94 [illegible] 870
[illegible] 24-9-95 [illegible] 663
[illegible] Pet 736 [illegible]

Refd putup. 15 1 98

DHK
17/1/98.

Sent with reference to the Under Secretary's order on the petn. The references are in the Pet: Branch and the further report called for in this office No. Pet-736 of 24.9.95 does not seem to have been received although reminder is put up for approval.

17/1/98

17/1/98

21/1/98

SR 14 of 97

1897 (10)

No. 1575

Name of Petitioner Nilgiri Puttamma

Village

Taluk

District Mysore

Date of Arzi 13-12-97

Date of Receipt 16-12-97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil

ABSTRACT

The petitioner as the Abka contractor of the Mysore Sub-division deposited 500 Rs as security for the d performance of the said Co -tract. His contract period expired in March 1892. He requested the Dy Commr of Mysore several times to refund the amount of 500 Rs deposited by him. He has paid all the Govt: dues. The Dy Commr of Mysore has withheld the refund of the deposit-

on account of the lease amount
for the Suvvamangam
Villages of Arsikere & Sangamm
not having been paid by the
Contractor. The petitioner states
that Arsikere is within his
Sub-Div. while Sangamm
is situated within Nanjangode
Sub-Division to which
Chikka Muddappa was the
Contractor; that no lease
amount was usually paid
to either the Suvvamangamdevs
or to Govt: for Arsikere Village;
that his representations on
former occasions have been
overlooked -

Prays that the amount
of deposit may be refunded
with such reasonable interest
as the Govt: deem fit to grant
to the Petitioner considering the
long period during which his
money has been in Govt: -

27/12/97

Circulated in file
Petn Br
Please register
& send to
Queens Br
15/12/97
12/97

No 1565

To

The Commissioners
to deal with the
Mahanadi Regent of
Mysore at Bangalore.

1565R
6-12-97

The humble petition of Nilgiri
Pattanna Dêvanaj Mohalla,
Mysore

Respectfully Sheweth:—

1. That he was the Abkari
Contractor of the Mysore
Subdivision from April
1890 to December 1892.

2. That out of the deposit
amount lodged with the Govern-
ment for the due performance
of the said Contract a Sum
of Rs 5000/- has not yet been
returned to him by the Govern
ment though the petitioner
has paid all the Government
dues legally payable by him
under the said Contract.

3.

3. That the Deputy Commissioner of the Gunpowe district has withheld this amount because the lease amount of one the Samanamaya villages of Arasikere and Gangaguru has not been paid.

4. That the petitioner is not liable of any the payment of this lease amount. Arasikere belongs to this Subdivision and Gangaguru is within the Manjunde Subdivision the lease of which had been taken by Chickbundapura. The village of Arasikere was not paying any lease amount either to the Samanamayadan or to the Government, but after when the System of Farming out was withdrawn and after the present Ryotwise System was introduced. The latter village of Gangaguru was paying the lease amount but Chickbundapura within

which

whose Sub division this village is, is liable for this amount, but not the petitioner. Lakshmanappa and the Petitioner are not joint contractors. Thus, the Deputy Commissioner is wrong in having withheld the said amount of Rs 3500.

5. That the petitioner made several applications both personally and through pleaders to the Deputy Commissioner for the return of this amount. But he has not been pleased to give him any reply, nor has he returned to him this amount.

6. That upon this petitioner made several applications to Your Honours praying therein that the Deputy Commissioner may be directed to return this amount to him. One of those applications viz of 18-9-94 got him an endorsement

C/o:

(No. 17/110 of the December 6th/8th) that the application had been forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner for his report thereon. Nothing more has been done till now.

7. That this amount has been lying for a long time without any use to the petitioner and he has been deprived of the benefit he would have derived if this amount had been with him. He prays that reasonable interest on this amount may be given to him.

8. That petitioner therefore prays that an order at an early date may be passed directing the Deputy Commissioner to return to him the said sum of Rs 5000 as soon as practicable with such interest thereon as Your Honour may think proper under the peculiar circumstances mentioned above.

9. That the petitioner files

It is convenient to attend your Honors' office every now and then as he is in Mysore and so he has appointed his gumasta Chikkaramayya to attend to this matter in this office.

For this act of kindness the petitioner as in duty bound, shall ever pray for your Honors. &c &c &c

&c &c &c Yeramma

13th December 1897 Mysore

Pol 1283 & connected papers are herewith

1283

Rev Bro.

Please put up Proceedings of 1893, referred to within

AK 10/5/98

Proc. of 1893 quoted in forwarding

Ex 418

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

(13)

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

Dated 29th April 1898

Despatched

Received

General No. 184
No.

Enclosure No. 1 finding

Submitting copy of finding recorded after holding an enquiry into the claims of Nagappa Pattana of Mysore for the refund of 500 Rs held in deposit in connection with his late Abkary contract.

Rev 4.5.98

Translate this & return

10/5

No. 184
Enclosure No. 1 finding

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT.
Dated April 1898.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

SIR,

With reference to Government Proceedings No. Petition 736 dated Camp Mysore 24/27th September 1895, calling for certain additional information regarding the application of Hiligeri Poottaunah of Mysore for the refund of Rs 500 held in deposit in connection with his late abkari contract, I have the honor to state as follows ——

The enquiry now held shews that there was no shop in Arsikere

13/a

In the office of the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Enquiry into the claim of the holders of the Sarvamanyam village of Ganaganur in Nanjungud Taluq, and of Arsinkere in Mysore Taluk, to the Toddy revenue of those villages.—

The present holder of the two villages in question is Mr. Gopal Raj Urs, and his gumasta Sibi Narsaiya has been deputed by the Palace Controller to explain the grounds on which the claim is put forward.

First, with regard to Ganaganur village. The village was granted as Sarvamanyam to Kristne Urs by the late Maha Rajah of Mysore under deed of gift dated 5th April 1826, which is referred to in the authenticated copy of the Inam Register filed. This copy as well as the Inam Title deed (also filed) clearly

says

says that the items of Sayer, Sendi and right to Forests, except sandal, are conceded.

Some documents have been filed to shew that the item has been all along enjoyed by the holder of the village. Among these are the following:-

1. Copy of account of Yanaga-hun village for 1881-82 marked A. This shews a demand of Rs 279-12-0 entered against the name of Contractor — Mooddappa on account of Eechala bale-
2. Copy of 10 years account of Yanaganun marked B. This shews the gamabundy amount on account of Sendi to be Rs 267 for each of the 6 years from Sookla to Bhava and Rs 305-0-6 for each of the 4 years from Yuva to Bahudhanya.
3. Muteyalika from the then Contractor dated 4th December 1868 marked C. This shews that the Contractor agreed to pay for Yanaganun village at the monthly rate of Rs 18-8-10.

or the yearly amount of Rs 222-10-8
from 1st November 1868 to 31st
March 1870.

The foregoing makes it clear
that not only is the holder of
the Sarvamanyam village
entitled to the Toddy Revenue
thereof, but has been also
enjoying it all along. His
claim to it must be accord-
ingly admitted.

How as regards the question
up to what period, the claim
of the holder to the toddy
revenue has been satisfied,
it appears from the statement
of Mr. Gopal Raj Urs's Gumasta
that it has been discharged
only up to the end of March
1887 and that payments are
still due for the subsequent
period

In Revenue Miscellaneous case
No: 15 of 1887-88, the Deputy
Commissioner (Mr. T. Ananda Rau)
ordered payment of Rs 1219-4-0
for 4 years from 1883-84 to

1886-87 at Rs 304-13-4 for the two villages of Ganaganur and Arsinkere though the amounts for each village are not separately shewn. There is a Receipt from the Palace Controller forthcoming to shew that payments were duly made, as per above order. No reference is available to prove payments for the subsequent period. The question of the amount due for the years 1890-91 and 1891-92 is under discussion. The new system of toddy administration came into force in 1892-93, and liability to pay since then devolves on Government. Mr R. C. Mooddappa was the person who held the toddy Contract of the Ranjungud Taluq during the two years 1890-91 and 1891-92 and as such, is liable to Mr Gopal Raj Urs

Mr. Gopal Raj Nro for the amount due for those two years. He will accordingly be called upon to shew whether he has discharged the claim, and if not, why he should not be required to do it now. Notice to issue, accordingly. The realizations from the sales held by Government since the introduction of the new system are as follows:—

	For Shop	For Groves
1892-93 ...	60-0-0	12-0-0
1893-94 ...	120-0-0	15-0-0
1894-95 ...	96-0-0	12-0-0
1895-96 ...	96-0-0	12-0-0
1896-97 ...	96-0-0	12-0-0

The total amount as above minus 5 per cent on account of cost of the Excise Establishment will now be paid to the Inamdar.

(sd) P. Srinivasa Rau
18/4/98.

As regards Arsikere, the documents filed are the following

Agreement entered into by the then Toddy Contractors agent to pay a monthly sum of Rs 1-10-11 for the Toddy tab for the period beginning with 1st August 1864 and ending with 31st October/68 dated 2nd September 1864 marked D.

Do .. Do .. dated 4th " December/68 shewing that the Contractor agreed to pay at a monthly rate of Rs 1-10-11 from 1st November/68 to 31st March 1870. (This is already marked C)

List shewing amount due on account of villages of Ganagamma and Arsinkere, sent from Mr " Gopal Raj Mrs's office to the Palace Controller. This shews that the yearly amount due for Ganagamma is Rs 279-12-0 at Rs 23-5-0 per month and for Arsinkere Rs 25-1-0 at

at- Rs 2-1-5 per month, total annual amount being Rs 304-13-4

As already stated, the amount of Rs 1219-4-4 awarded in Revenue Miscellaneous case No: 15 of 1887-88 is for four years, for both villages as specifically mentioned in the order. The amount is shewn to have been calculated at the yearly rate of Rs 304-13-4 which corresponds with the rate mentioned in the list produced from Mr. Gopal Raj Mrs's office. Though the order in the above Miscellaneous case does not shew the amount adjudged separately for each village, the information afforded by the documents filed, renders such separation possible, as it is clear that the total annual sum claimed

claimed viz Rs 304-13-0 is composed of two items viz Rs 279-12-0 for Ganagamm at Rs 23-5-0 per month, and Rs 25-1-0 for Arsinkeré at the rate of Rs 2-1-5 per month.

It is clear from the facts adduced above that the Inamdar has been enjoying the Toddy Revenue of Arsinkeré village. The question is whether he is entitled to it under the terms of the grant.

Copy of H.H. the late Maharajah Krishnaraja Wadiyar Bahadur's Sannad, filed, mentions "Eechala pyru" as among things conceded to the Inamdar and expressly reserves the right to sandal.

The Inam title deed contains the words "All other items except Abkary and Sandal are conceded".

Certified copy of the Inam Register, produced, contains the following words "Sharab or abkari and Sandal items

are Reserved, and the Inamdars may enjoy all items but those that have been lately abolished in all government villages". In a note added to the Register, shewing items enjoyed, the expression "Date trees" occurs. The question of title in this case accordingly rests on a right interpretation of the language used in the above documents.

How such language should be construed has already been decided by government in a case similar to the present one. In. Pro: No: 6621 Ex: 238 dated 19th January 1898, the government have held that in a case of this kind, the Inamdar is entitled under the new system of Toddy administration, to no

no more than the tree-rent from the date grove in this Inam village minus the cost of collection and the tree-tax as well as the revenue derived from the shop should be credited to Government. The Inamdar's title to the Abkary revenue being inadmissible under the circumstances, the question whether he is entitled to get anything on account of rent for toddy trees during the last 3 years remains to be considered. This question naturally depends for its answer upon how many toddy-yielding trees there are in the village, and whether those trees were actually tapped for the purposes of toddy by the Contractor.

It may be noted here that in a list prepared

in this office and sub-
mitted to Government in
June 1889, the number of
toddy-yielding trees in the
village is shewn as 500 or 600.
The Mysore Taluq Amildar
having been written to in
October/95 for information on
the subject, his report
dated 7th November/95 shews
that there has been no toddy
shop in the village since
1875, that before that date,
one is said to have existed,
that the village has no toddy
grove, that some trees are
found scattered in occu-
pied and cultivated lands,
that these trees do not yield
toddy, that no toddy was
ever exported from the village,
that when a shop existed
in the village before 1875,
it used to be supplied
with toddy from Harohally
grove, and that since
the

the new system of toddy administration came into force in 1892-93, there is neither shop in the village nor has the <u>toddy</u> been sold

Against these facts, the gumasta that appears for M/s Gopalraj Nro has nothing to say.

According to the Deputy Commissioner's award in Revenue Miscellaneous Case No: 15 of 1887-88 M/s Gopal Raj Nro has been paid the Inamdar's dues for the village at Rs 25-1-a for 4 years up to the end of 1886-87: so that M/s Gopal Raj Nro's present claim is for the subsequent period. In view of the facts above stated, the claim must be disallowed.

(Sd) P. Srinivasa Rau
18/4/98

(Sd) K. P. Puttanna Chetty
Offg: Dy: Commr
24/4/98.

"Copy"
Certified
Compared
Asst

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, (Revenue),—dated 11th July 1893.

No. 443-51—R. 69, DATED, BANGALORE, 11TH JULY 1893.

ORDER.—The attention of Deputy Commissioners is drawn to para 5 of Government Proceedings No. 1019-29—Cir. 4, dated the 12th April 1892, calling for a report in each case of claim for Toddy Revenue in an Inam village, and they are requested to submit their report as soon as a decision is arrived at in each case. As far as possible, the enquiry should be conducted in the manner prescribed in Sections 201 and 202 of the Land Revenue Code for formal inquiries. The record should, among other particulars, furnish information under the following heads :—

1. Taluk and name of Inam village.
2. Name of Inamdar.
3. Date and other particulars of the grant under which the Toddy Revenue is conceded to the Inamdar.
4. If the concession is not explicitly granted by Sannad, under what circumstances and on what grounds it is claimed.
5. Amount of annual payment, if any, made to the Inamdar on account of Toddy Revenue up to 1891-92.
6. The data upon which the information under head 5 is based.
7. Probable number of mature Toddy trees from which Toddy is drawn.
8. What shops have been supplied by these trees in 1892-93 and 1893-94.
9. What shops, if any, have been established within the village in 1892-93 and 1893-94.
10. The Demand, Collection and Balance on account of Revenue by separate sales in 1892-93 and 1893-94.

T. ANANDA ROW,
Chief Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioners of Districts.
The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

Exd.—A.N.S.

1893.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

REVENUE.

PROCEEDINGS.

Dated 11*th July* 1893.

No. 443-51.
R. 69.

Inviting Deputy Commissioners' attention to Government Order No. 1019-29—4, dated 12th April 1892, calling for a report in each case of claim for Toddy Revenue in an Inam village, and requesting submission of the report as soon as a decision is arrived at in each case.

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—12-7-93.—120.

Draft as herewith

To

The Excise Commr
in Mysore

S.R. 14 of 9695

Sl 9

No 11430 / EX:470 Encls 4
Dated 9 June 1898

Correspondence ending with the Mysore Dy. Commr's letter no 184 of 29th April 98 re the claim of Nelapiri pullamma of Mysore for the refund of Rs 500/- held in deposit in connection with his late Toddy Contract

has the honr to forward for opinion, the correspondence referred to above and to state that by a regrettable oversight, the requisition for a refund was sent direct to the Dy. Commr, Mysore instead

* to be kindly returned

B. O."

9/6/98
for Secretary

AB
7/6/98

Putup a list of the papers to be sent to the Excise Comr

Ex. 62

Gen. 30]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 1007
AUG. 11 1898
DEWAN'S OFFICE

S. R 1894-95
SC 10

From

The Excise Commissioner
(15) in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Dept.s.

Dated 8th August 1898.

Despatched

Received

General No. 1115

No 57

Enclosure No. 1 file

In reply to Secretary's docket No. 11430
dated 9th June 1898 Ex 470

SUBJECT.

Submits his opinion that the Inamdar of both Ganaganur and Arsinkere, is entitled to toddy revenue.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Excise
Rec'd 10/8/98

Submitted
with office note contained

18/8/98

Excise Commissioner's office

No. 1115/57 Rem: 1 file Bangalore, dated 8th August 1898.

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

In returning herewith, the original enclosures of your docket No. 11430/Ex 470, dated 9th June 1898, I have the honor to state that the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore district, has recorded that the claim to toddy revenue as regards Gangaganur village, is admissible, and that the same in the case of Arsinkere village, cannot be allowed.

2. In the accompanying authenticated copies of the Sannads of both the above villages, the word "Eachel pyroo" is included in the various items of revenue alienated to the Inamdar. If, in the case of Gangaganur, the word "Eachelpyroo" is taken to mean toddy revenue, then in the case of Arsikere also it should be taken to mean toddy revenue.

3. In the Inam Settlement Register of Gangaganur it is noted:- "The items of Sayer, Sendi (toddy) are enjoyed

enjoyed by the parties, as also the forests except Sandal which is reserved"; and in the items enjoyed "Sendi" is included. In the Inam Settlement Register of Arsinkere, it is noted - "Sharab or Abkari and Sandal items are reserved, and the Inamdars may enjoy all items but those that have been lately abolished in all Government villages"; and in the items of revenue enjoyed, "Date trees" are included. In one Register the word "Eachelpyroo" occurring in the Sannad, has been apparently translated as "Sendi", and in the other as "Date trees". It is clear from the accounts produced before the Deputy Commissioner and referred to in his finding that the Inamdar has been enjoying toddy revenue for both the above villages. As the words "Sharab or Abkari" are used in the Settlement Register of Arsinkere, the word "Abkari" as therein used should be taken to apply only to "Sharab" or Arrack, but not in its general sense to toddy also.

also; and therefore the item of toddy cannot be construed as having been reserved, more especially having regard to the general drift of the Sannad which alienates wholesale the whole sources of revenue excepting that from Sandal. Accordingly I am of opinion that the Inamdar is entitled to toddy revenue for both Ganaganur and Arsinkere.

4. The Government Proceedings No. 6621 / Ex 238, dated 19th January 1898, quoted in the officiating Deputy Commissioner's finding regarding Arsinkere village, relates to Dudgare' Inam village, in the Sannad whereof neither Sendi, nor "Eachelpyroo," nor Abkari is expressly mentioned as having been alienated to the grantee of the village. The case of Dudgare is therefore different from that of Arsinkere.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

F. Burrows Jr

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Ramachandrakao

Manager

Mathuran

For Deputy Commissioner

Anpur District

ಅನುಬಂಧ-೨

ಅಫಿಡವಿಟ್

ನಾನು ಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಸರಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರನು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಮೇಲಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಸಂಗತಿಗಳು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸತ್ಯವಾಗಿವೆ.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರನ ಸಹಿ

ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರನ ಸಹಿ

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರನ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸ

——— ۱۰ ———

——— ۱۰ ———

——— ۱۰ ———

Draft despatch 64

To

The Income Commr. in Jaffna

No. 1613. dated 31-8-98. (16)

S. R. Nijar 1895-97

S & P

His letter No. 1115/57 of 8th August 1898 stating with reference to the claim of Nilgiri Puttama of Jaffna for the refund of Rs. 500/- held in deposit in connection with the arrears due to certain Inamdars that the Inamdar of Ganagamar, and Arsiakere is entitled to the Toddy Revenue of both the villages.

In reply has the honour to ~~enquire~~ request further information on the following points:-

(1) Where was no toddy shop at Arsikere either during the 2 years in question (1890-91 & 1891-92) or for a long time previously. In the village there are not date trees either. How then was the contractor liable to pay any money to the Inamdar?

(2) Was the contractor in any way to blame for not setting up a shop at Arsikere.

(3) Has any shop been opened since 1892-93.

(4) Has Government paid the Inamdar

:: of the fourth
Jaffna dy:
4-57-98 A
It is stated

Inamdar any advance on account of
Arrears since 1892-93?

By Order

17/8/95

for Secretary

G.A. No. 7511
June 1-189
Ex. No. 397

Excise]

~~18~~ 1899

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT. OF MYSORE,

General and Revenue Depts

Dated 26th May 1899.

Despatched 29 — do —

Received

General No. 7628

No. 400 Enclosure No. 1 + a file

G.V.P.

In reply to Secretary's docket No. 8562 Ex: 324 dated, 23rd instant.

SUBJECT.

Forwards copy of communications from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, and submits further information together with his opinion regarding the liability of the old Toddy contractors of the Mysore District to pay money to the Inamdar of Arasinkere on account of toddy revenue.

References
(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

No. 7628/408 Encl and a file of V.P.

Excise Commissioner's office
Bangalore, dated 26th/29th May 1899.

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To.

The Secretary to Government
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. 8562/Ex:324, dated 23rd instant, calling for certain further information regarding the liability of the old Toddy contractors of the Mysore District to pay money to the Inamdar of Arasinkere on account of toddy revenue, I have the honor to submit herewith copy of communications Nos. 227, dated 24th December 1898, and 395, dated 22nd/23rd May 1899, together with the original enclosures thereof, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, and to state that on careful examination and enumeration of the date trees existing at Arsinkere, it has been ascertained that there are altogether 657 date trees in it, both in occupied and unoccupied lands; that the whole of them are fit for tapping, and that four of them, which are very old, bear incisions indicating that toddy used to be drawn during the District farming contract system.

2. The District contractors used to keep some

Shops

Shops open and close others according to their convenience. Therefore they were to blame for not setting up a shop at Arsinkere where one appears to have existed before 1875.

3. Under the above circumstances, I am of opinion that the old District Contractors were liable to pay money to the Inamdar of Arsinkere on account of toddy revenue.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

your most obedient servant

[illegible]

For Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Deputy Commissioner's office
Mysore District
Dated 24th December 1898.

No 227
Encl: No 3.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

To.

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Sir,

Adverting to your official memorandum No 1714/89, dated 1st September 1898, forwarding for further report copy of Secretary's docket no: 1613/Ex:79, dated 31st August 1898, in re certain points on which information was required, I have the honor to forward herewith canarese yadi from Mr Gopalraje Urs, Inamdar of Arasinakere, received through the Palace Comptroller with his canarese yadi No 122, dated 15th instant.

I have &c

(Sd.) P. Sreenivasa Rao
for Dy: Commissioner
Mysore District.

From.

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To. The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Dated 22d May 1899
Despatched 23d —do—

№ 395.

His docket № 4188/142, dated 31st December 1898, requesting that the number of date trees existing in the Arasinkere Inam village belonging to Mr. Gopalraja Ders may be caused to be counted and particulars reported &c

With reference to the above has the honor to forward herewith in original Vernacular correspondence ending with Mysore Range Supervisor's report № 1113, dated 28th March 1899 on the subject.

(Sd) H. Matthan.
For Dy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Copy

For Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

ಸೇವೆಗೆ

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣಯ್ಯ
ಶಾಸಕರು
ಮದ್ದೂರು ವಿಧಾನಸಭಾ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೆ,

ನಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಶಾಸಕರಾದ ತಾವು ಕಳೆದ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಮದ್ದೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಶ್ರಮಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸಂತೋಷದ ವಿಷಯ. ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಮನವಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಗೆತ್ತಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಪೂರ್ಣಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಗತಿಯಲ್ಲಿವೆ. ಈ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಮನವಿಗಳ ವಿವರ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿದೆ.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಪು.ಪ.ಸ/ಕಾ.ಕ್ರ/ಮನವಿ/ಸಂ.ಸ/ 7455 ದಿನಾಂಕ: 16.12.98

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು
ಪುರಸಭೆ
ಮದ್ದೂರು

ಪ್ರ—ಫಿರ್ಯಾದಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂತೋಷ ಅಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ ಪಾಟೀಲ ಸಾಹುಕಾರ

ಈ ಮಾಲಕರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಇದೆ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಅಲ್ಲವೆ

ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಇವೆ

ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಇವೆ ಅಂತ ನಿಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆಯೆ

ಉ—ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಇವೆ ಅಂತ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ

ಪ್ರ—ಫಿರ್ಯಾದಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂತೋಷ ಅಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ ಪಾಟೀಲ ಸಾಹುಕಾರ ಇವರು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಇವೆ ಅಂತ ನಿಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆಯೆ

ಉ—ಫಿರ್ಯಾದಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂತೋಷ ಅಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ ಪಾಟೀಲ ಸಾಹುಕಾರ ಇವರು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಇವೆ ಅಂತ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ

ಪ್ರ—ಫಿರ್ಯಾದಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂತೋಷ ಅಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ ಪಾಟೀಲ ಸಾಹುಕಾರ ಇವರು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಇವೆ ಅಂತ ನಿಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವ

M. Gopal Raj Jain

Encl. as above

Yours faithfully,

Kindly acknowledge receipt of the same.

Thanking you,

Please find enclosed herewith a cheque bearing No. 7 0 2 8 4 8 dated 5.7.87 for Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees one thousand only) drawn on Syndicate Bank, Gandhi Nagar Branch, Bangalore in favour of Shri Gopal Raj Jain, Advocate, Bangalore, being the amount of Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees one thousand only) paid by you to me as per your letter dated 5.7.87 for the purpose of filing a Writ Petition in the Supreme Court of India, challenging the validity of the Karnataka Land Reforms (Amendment) Act, 1987.

Dear Sir,

ಸಂ 517

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು
ಮಂಗಳೂರು

ಮಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಛೇರಿ

ಮಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಛೇರಿಯ

ದಿನಾಂಕ - 24.11.1898

ಮಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಉಳಾಯಿಬೆಟ್ಟು ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಪೈಕಿ
ಕಸಬಾ ಅಡ್ಯಾರು ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 1714 ಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ
ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 1613 ಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾಲೀಕರಾದ
ಮೇಲೆ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರವರ ಆದೇಶದಂತೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 1714 ಕ್ಕೆ
ಸೇರಿದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನಧಿಕೃತವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ
ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರವುಗೊಳಿಸಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದು ಅದರಂತೆ ಸದರಿ
ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರವುಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್
ಮಂಗಳೂರು

76 96

From,

The Secretary to the
Government of Madras
General and Revenue
Department

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Madras

Dated 31st August 1898)
General no. 1613/
Ex: no: 79

His letter no: 1115/57, dated 8th August/98
Stating with reference to the Claim of
Nilgiri Puttaun of Madras for the
refund of Rs 500/, held in deposit in
Connection with the arrears due to certain
Inamdars, - that the Inamdar of
Lyanaganur and Araikere is entitled
to the Toddy Revenue of both the villages.

In reply he has the honor to request further
information on the following points: -
(1) There was no toddy Shop at Araikere
either during the 2 years in question
(1890-91 and 1891-92) or for a long
time previously. In the village there

are

Are we to take free, either. Now then is
the Contractor liable to pay any money
to the Omandar?

(2) Is the Contractor in any way
to blame for not setting up a shop
at Arasikere?

"As under"

Sd/- A. Nainthavavany Rao.
For Secretary.

Special Commissioner's Office
Bangalore, Dated 12th September 98.

No: 1714
-98

Official Memorandum

Copy of the foregoing is forwarded
to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur
District, for early report.

Sd/- D. Venkatarangaiyengar
For Special Commissioner
in Mysore.

Copy"

M Krishnamurthy
For Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

78 22

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated 28/31" December 1898

No: 6188
162

The Deputy Commissioner's letter no: 227 dated 24" instant

(—)

In reply has the honor to state that Mr. Gopalaraya avu says in his Yadi received with the above, that there are some date trees in his Inam Narasimatere village, which used to be tapped formerly. Requests that the number of date trees existing in the village may be caused to be counted, and particulars reported as to how many mature trees there are at present and how many there were in the years 1890-91 and 1891-92, and how many of the existing trees bear marks of old incisions

(Sd) S. Venkataranga Ayenga
for Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

VO 131 to 140

Dy Commissioner
Mysore
dt 5th January 99

(5) My forwarded to the Inspector
Mysore Range to report, at an
early date, on all the points
referred to therein

Personal Asst
to Commissioner
Mysore

No. 397
dt 6
4/1

Forwarded to Insp Ramaswamy
who is directed to inspect the premises
and submit a report on all the
points called for by the Commissioner
at an early date as possible.

8-1-99

Circle
Inspector
Mysore City
7-1-99

80

38

11

28

10

7

9

4

11

8

157

30-1-1899.

1113 7/10 1082 29/3/99 [illegible]

Recd 29/3/99 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 4 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1890-91 [illegible] 1891-92 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

తే: 28.3.99

[illegible]

S. R. No. 979-95

S & [illegible]

Please see 2nd Councillor's remarks inside :-

"Received in person. Put up references at once please"

(Sd) C.S.

30/3/01

Submitted, to 2nd Councillor

The draft-rules are before the Council.

1/4/01.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
1900 G.O. No. 649
MAR 30 1900
A. Subba Rao

From

Nelizipy Puttamah
Residing in Mysore,
Bangalore

To

THE SECY. TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GEN. & REV. DEPTS.

Dated 29/3/01

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Requesting early orders in re the appeal filed by him in connection with the refund of Rs 500 deposited by him for the abkari contract of Mysore Sub Div in the year 1892 with a view that a certain sum of money be deducted out of the above said deposit amount of 500 Rs and paid to the Inamdar of Arbikere attached to the above Sub Div &

References to be marked.

Presented in person
at
29/3/01

To.

Principal Sheristadar
above pleased
at 30
30/3/01

The Secretary to the Govt: of Mysore
(Genl & Rev: Departments)
Bangalore

The humble petition of Heliziery Puttamah
Residing in Mysore -

Respectfully Sheweth:

That the Petitioner begs to lay the following to the favorable consideration and orders -

That your Petitioner has not favored with any final order to the appeal filed by him in connection with the refund of 500 Rs deposited by him for the Abkari Contract of Mysore Sub Division in the year 1892 with a view that a certain sum of money to be deducted out of the above said deposit amount of 500 Rs and paid to the Inamdar of Arsikere attached to the above Subdivision.

That your Petitioner further submits to point out that since the introduction of the Contract system in the Province upto the exp-piry of the Petitioner's Contract of Mysore Sub Dn. the said Inamdar has not paid a single pie, nor any Sannads or Hookums were produced by the Inamdar to establish such right as to the recovery of a certain sum of money due to him

That your Petitioner further represents that if the Government is satisfied that even in the absence of any such Sannads or Hookums, the Inamdar should be remunerated; the petitioner is bound to obey the order of Government & the balance remains still due to the Petitioner out of the deposit of 500 Rs may be kindly ordered to be refunded to him early.

The long delay in not making the above prayer is due to the fact if the above request is made the Government may get to believe the Petitioner's admission for payment of money to the Inamdar Hence delay

For which act of kindness the Petitioner shall ever pray.

Bangalore
29th March 1901.

Your Honors
Most Obedient
(Sd) Heliziery Puttamah

Draft as per cvt

Read:— ~~21~~ 8462

S.R 14/94-95
SL 14

The Excise Commr.

Ltr correspondence ending with letter no 7628/400 dated 26/29th May 1899 from ~~submitting~~ certain further ~~information~~ ~~together with~~ submitting certain further information together with his opinion, regarding the liability of the old toddy contractors of the Mysore district, to pay money to the Inamdar of Arsinkere on account of toddy revenue of the inam village.

Also petition ~~Registered~~ dated 29th March 1901 from Nidigiri puttanna praying for the refund of Rs 500/- deposited by him for the Abkary contract of certain Taluks in the Mysore district for 1898.

No: 7945-6 / Exc. J.9-98 84/4/01 / 4

Ordered thereon ~~Exd~~ 8/4/01

Nidigiri puttanna in

his petition read above

pleas for early orders. He
is agreeable to a portion of the
deposit being withheld pending
the determination of the question
whether the Inamdar is entitled
to the toddy revenue of the village of Arenkere
or not. The record shows that
the Inamdar used to get from
the District Contractors under
the old system, a lump sum
of Rs 304-13-4 and this payment
is said to have been in
satisfaction of his claim
for the toddy revenue of both
the villages of Arsinkered
Ganaganur. As regards
the factum of payment
there seems to be no dispute
while there is one as to whether
that payment was being made
on account of both the villages
or only on that of Ganaganur.
However that may be, it is
clear that there is no justi-
fication for any longer with-
holding the whole of puttanna

deposit of Rs 500/-. According to Muddappa's contention, puttanna is liable to pay half of Rs 304-13 viz 152-6-6 on account of Arsukere, while according to the Dy Commr's report this liability does not extend to more than as 100/- Rs. In any event, such liability cannot exceed the former sum Government accordingly direct that this sum will be deducted and the balance of the deposit of Rs 500/- returned to puttanna at once without prejudice to his claiming the whole or any portion of the sum thus deducted, should it be hereafter held that no toddy revenue on account of Arsukere is payable to the Inamdar or that the amount withheld is excessive

To The Excise Commr
" Comptroller

2 Offrs

For Secretary.

KS 21/4/1.

Draft copy etc 97

Endorsement

No: 7947 24/4/04
Rn 7-9-98
4

S. 2147 94-95
SC 15

In reply to his petition dated 29th March 1904 praying that the deposit of Rs 500/- made on account of the Abkary. Contract of certain Taluks in the Mysore District for 1898, may be ordered to be refunded to him, deducting, if necessary, the ~~sum~~ amount which is likely to be due from the petitioner to the Inamdar of Arsikere village on account of the toddy revenue, in case the Inamdar is held to have a right for such revenue of the village in question Nilgiri Pukkanna Mysore, is informed that, out of the ~~sum~~ deposit of Rs 500/- made by him Rs ~~347-9-6~~ a sum of Rs 347-9-6 has been ordered to be refunded to him, ~~Rs balance~~ without prejudice to the claiming

the whole or any portion of

the balance ~~was deducted,~~ withheld

should it be hereafter

held that no toddy revenue

on account of the toddy kere

village is payable to the

Inamdar or that the amount

withheld is excessive

B O

For Secretary

2 d/s

KG

2/4/07.

(23)

To

The Excise Commr
Mysore

no 8758 / Ex.7.9-98 dt 29/4/01
dated April 1901.

In forwarding herewith for information a copy of the endorsement no 7947/Ex.7.9-98 dated 4th April 1901 granted to Nilgiri Puttanna, informing him that out of the deposit of Rs 500/- made by him, a sum of Rs 347-9-6 has been ordered to be refunded to him, has the honor to state that the deduction of Rs 152-6-6, therein referred to applies only to one year and to request that the Deputy Commr, Mysore District, may be instructed at once to make a proportionate deduction for the two years (1890-91 & 1891-92) during which the contract was held

~~Supd Excise~~. S. No 8758 dt 29-4-01

~~Supd Excise~~

The previous order & endt were issued on the supposition that the contract was for one year. This supposition is wrong & hence this worked

17/4/01.

by Nilapura puttanna, at the rate of Rs 152-6-6 per year and to inform him accordingly.

"B O"

Secretary.

Please submit to 2nd wdr
Or if you can do it in office tomorrow. Otherwise issue tomorrow

26/4

Rect
6-30
27/4/01.

Sl 7. From Nilgiri Puttanna, Mysore.

Petition Registered No 1565 R. Dt-16-12-97

Submits petition praying that his Case may be Settled early and the refund of deposit amount with reasonable interest thereon may be ordered.

Sl 8. From the ~~Mysore~~ Dy Comr, Mysore Distt.

No 184 Dt. 29th April 1898.

Submits Copy of proceedings recorded, after holding an enquiry into the Claims of Nilgiri Puttanna of Mysore for the refund of Rs. 500/- held in deposit in Connection with his late Abkari Contract.

Sl 9. To the Excise Comr No $\frac{11430}{R \times 470}$ Dt- 9 June 1898.

Forwards for opinion, the Correspondence referred to with the Dy Comr, Mysore Distt.

Sl 10. From the Excise Comr No $\frac{1115}{57}$ Dt 8th Aug 98.

Submits his opinion that the Inamdar of both Ganagnur and Arsinkere, is entitled to toddy Revenue

Sl 11. To the Excise Comr No $\frac{1613}{R \times 79}$ Dt 31-8-98.

Requests further information on (1) there was no toddy Shop at Arsinkere either during the two years in question (1890-91 & 1891-92) or for a long time previously (2) whether the Contractor was in any way to blame for not setting up a Shop at Arsinkere, &c

Sl 12 From the Excise Comr No $\frac{7628}{400}$ Dt- $\frac{26}{29}$ May 98.

Forwards Copy of Communication from the Dy Comr, and Submits further information together with his opinion on the points referred to above. Sl-

SL 13. From Nilgiri Puttanna Mysore.

Diary No 6497/Ex 296 dt 29-3-01.

Requests early orders in re the Appeal filed by him in connection with the Refund of Rs 500/- with a view that a certain sum of money to be deducted out of the above deposit amount and paid to the Encumbrance of Areas here attached to the above Sub-Dn.

SL 14. To the Excise Commr & The Comptroller Nos 7945-6/Ex.7.9798 dt. 4-4-1901.

Passes orders on the Claim of N. Puttanna of Mysore, re the refund of Rs 500/- deposited by him.

SL 15. To N. Puttanna, Mysore.

No 7947/Ex.7.9798 dt. 4-4-01.

Intimates a refund of Rs 347-9-6 out of the deposit of Rs 500/- made by him.

SL 16. To the Excise Commr in Mysore.

No 8758/Ex.7.5-198.

dt 29 April 01.

Forwards a copy of the preceding letter requesting that the Deduction of Rs 152-6-6 therein was due to one year, and requests that the Dy Commr may be intimated to make a proportionate deduction for two years (1890-91) and (1891-92). the Contract was held by Nilgiri Puttanna at the rate of Rs 152-6-6, per year, and to inform him accordingly.